

The Yuma County Planning and Zoning Commission met in a regular session on January 27, 2026. The meeting was held in Aldrich Auditorium at 2351 West 26th Street, Yuma, Arizona.

CALL TO ORDER: At 5:30 p.m. Chairman Danny Bryant convened the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Commissioners present were: A-J Mosqueda, Ron Rice, Tim Bowers, Ron Van Why, Danny Bryant, Matias Rosales, Bobbi McDermot and Hugo Garcia. Commissioners absent were: Scott Mulhern and Jim Allen. Others present were: Planning Director Maggie Castro, AICP, Deputy County Attorney Minda Davy; Senior County Attorney Kesia Morrison; Senior Planner Javier Barraza; Senior Planner Jesus Carrillo; Senior Planner Richard Munguia and PZ Commission Administrative Specialist Heidi Ramirez.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Chairman Danny Bryant led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ITEM No. 3: Elect a Chairman for the Yuma County Planning & Zoning Commission for calendar year 2026.

MOTION (MCDERMOTT/ RICE): Elect Ron Van Why as Chairman for calendar year 2026.

VOICE VOTE: Mosqueda-AYE; Rice-AYE; Bowers-AYE; Bryant-AYE; Van Why-AYE; Rosales-AYE; McDermott-AYE; Garcia-AYE

The motion carried 8-0.

ITEM No. 4: Elect a Vice-Chairman for the Yuma County Planning & Zoning Commission for calendar year 2026.

MOTION (MCDERMOTT/ RICE) Elect Danny Bryant as Vice-Chairman for calendar year 2026.

VOICE VOTE: Mosqueda-AYE; Rice-AYE; Bowers-AYE; Bryant-AYE; Van Why-AYE; Rosales-AYE; McDermott-AYE; Garcia-AYE

Motion carried 8-0.

ITEM No. 5: Review and approval of the 2026 Regular Meeting Schedule for the Planning & Zoning Commission.

MOTION (ROSALES/ VAN WHY): Approve as presented.

VOICE VOTE: Mosqueda-AYE; Rice-AYE; Bowers-AYE; Bryant-AYE; Van Why-AYE; Rosales-AYE; McDermott-AYE; Garcia-AYE

Motion carried 8-0.

ITEM No. 6: Approval of Planning and Zoning Commission regular meeting minutes of December 16, 2025.

MOTION (MCDERMOTT/ MOSQUEDA): Approve as presented.

VOICE VOTE: Mosqueda-AYE; Rice-AYE; Bowers-AYE; Bryant-AYE; Van Why-AYE; Rosales-AYE; McDermott-AYE; Garcia-AYE

Motion carried 8-0.

Senior Planner Javier Barraza requested the Commission to open Minor Amendment Case No. 25-08 and Rezoning Case No. 25-21 simultaneously as they are co-related and same parcel.

ITEM No. 7: Minor Amendment Case No. 25-08: Zachary M. Reeves requests to change the land use designation of a parcel approximately 1.04 gross acres in size from Agriculture / Rural Preservation (A-RP) to Mixed Use Residential (R-MU), Assessor's Parcel Number 201-10-016, located in the vicinity of Avenue 31 E and County 12th Street, Wellton, Arizona.

Senior Planner Javier Barraza presented Minor Amendment Case No. 25-08 recommending approval based on:

1. The proposed change will not adversely affect the natural environment condition in the area.
2. The proposed change will not require public expenditure for infrastructure improvements.
3. The proposed change will not have adverse effects on the health and safety of present and future residents.
4. The proposed change addresses an oversight in the plan.

Vice-Chairman Bryant opened the discussion to the public.

There being no one to come forward, Vice-Chairman Bryant closed the discussion to the public.

MOTION (BOWERS/ VAN WHY): Approve as presented.

VOICE VOTE: VOICE VOTE: Mosqueda-AYE; Rice-AYE; Bowers-AYE; Bryant-AYE; Van Why-AYE; Rosales-AYE; McDermott- AYE; Garcia-AYE

The motion carried 8-0.

ITEM No. 8: Rezoning Case No. 25-20: Zachary M. Reeves requests the rezoning of a parcel approximately 1.04 gross acres in size from Rural Area-40 acre minimum (RA-40) to Recreational Vehicle Subdivision (RVS), Assessor's Parcel Number 201-10-016, located in the vicinity of Avenue 31 E and County 12th Street, Wellton, Arizona.

Senior Planner Javier Barraza presented Rezoning Case No. 25-20 recommending approval of this request based on the request is within the range of identified uses, densities and intensities of the Comprehensive Plan, subject to the following Performance Condition.

Performance Condition.

1. Within 60 day s of approval by the Board of Supervisors, the owner or agent shall:

- a) Record an Avigation disclosure statement.
- b) Record an Infrastructure disclosure statement.
- c) Record an Agriculture disclosure statement.

Chairman Van Why inquired staff as to where the access to the property was.

Senior Planner Javier Barraza stated the access was north of parcel 16, there is an easement on the north that runs from Avenue 31 E all the way to the property and connects to parcel 15.

Vice-Chairman Bryant opened the discussion to the public.

There being no one to come forward, Vice-Chairman Bryant closed the discussion to the public.

MOTION (BOWERS/ MOSQUEDA): Approve as presented.

VOICE VOTE: VOICE VOTE: Mosqueda-AYE; Rice-AYE; Bowers-AYE; Bryant-AYE; Van Why-AYE; Rosales-AYE; McDermott- AYE; Garcia-AYE The motion carried 8-0.

The motion carried 8-0.

ITEM No. 9: Rezoning Case No. 25-21: Oscar Galindo, agent for Guillermo and Maria Jesus Galindo Trust, requests the rezoning of two parcels totaling 10 gross acres in size from Rural Area – 10 acre minimum (RA-10) to Suburban Site Built – 2 acre minimum (SSB-2), Assessor's Parcel Numbers 755-06-001 and -002, located at 1305 & 1315 East County 16th Street, Yuma, Arizona; located within the 65 dB noise zone.

Senior Planner Richard Munguia presented Rezoning Case No. 25-21 recommending approval of the request based on the request being within the range of identified uses, densities and intensities of the Comprehensive Plan, subject to the following Performance Condition and Schedule for Development:

Performance Condition:

1. Within 180 days of approval by the Board of Supervisors, the owner shall submit the following documents to the Department of Development Services:
 - a. A recorded avigation disclosure statement;
 - b. A recorded Schedule for Development disclosure statement.

Schedule for Development:

Prior to development of the subject property or within (5) years of Board of Supervisors' approval, whichever comes first:

1. The property shall be split by means of a Land Division Permit pursuant to Section 507.00 of the Yuma County Zoning Ordinance.
2. All lots shall be provided with means of irrigation and access to irrigation water prior to development of any of the existing parcels. The owner/applicant will submit a letter from the irrigation district to the Department of Development Services confirming that a satisfactory irrigation system is installed and the individual lots will have access to irrigation water.

Board member McDermott asked staff if the items and equipment was on the two corners of the parcel and the location of the irrigation ditch.

Senior Planner Richard Munguia stated that the ditch was identified as being on the south side of the parcel.

Board member McDermott asked what unit it belonged to.

Senior Planner Richard Munguia stated it belonged to the Yuma Mesa Irrigation & Drainage District.

Board member Bowers asked fellow board member Rice how good the farmland was in that area.

Board member Rice explained that it depended on the crop, but that alfalfa required a lot more water and mostly everything on the Yuma Mesa required more water per acre compared to the valleys.

Chairman Van Why asked if the Commission would be violating any laws as far the ARS.

Planning Director Maggie Castro, AICP, explained that while the Yuma County Comprehensive Plan allows the requested density, state law prohibits residential development within the 65-decibel noise zone. If the rezoning to SSB-2 is approved, the applicant would still be required to seek a variance from the Board of Adjustment, and approval of the rezoning alone would not allow residential development on the property.

Board member McDermott asked if once the lots were developed, then selling them, they would have to notify them that there needs to be a variance to place a home.

Planning Director Maggie Castro, AICP, stated they could request a variance prior to the sale of the properties.

Board member Bowers commented if it was part of the Comprehensive plan to develop the land and not leave it was agriculture.

Planning Director, Maggie Castro, AICP, stated that the land use designation is Rural Density Residential, and the request to rezone to SSB-2 does not require an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, as the proposed zoning is already in compliance.

Board member McDermott also commented that the mesa is sandy soil, which can support citrus and other agricultural uses but is not considered prime farmland due to high sand and water usage. While development could cause temporary issues such as blowing dust, the land is considered more suitable for development than prime farmland in the valleys.

Vice-Chairman Bryant opened the discussion to the public.

Antonio Martinez, MCAS, Yuma Arizona, stated that they submitted a letter, signed by the colonel, recommending denial of the request due to safety concerns and interpretation of ARS provisions. While ARS allows limited residential exemptions tied to agricultural use, such as a primary residence or ancillary housing, the intent is to support ongoing farming operations, not increased residential density. He emphasized the importance of preserving agricultural land as the county's primary economic driver, with the military as the second, and maintaining minimal residential density in these areas. Based on these considerations, MCAS Yuma recommended denial of the request.

Vice-Chairman Bryant acknowledged the military's position and noted that similar interpretive differences between the county and the military have occurred in the past and expressed appreciation for MCAS Yuma's participation and for sharing their perspective with the Commission.

Antonio Martinez, MCAS, Yuma, Arizona, clarified that the interpretation being cited is based on Arizona Revised Statutes §28-8481, not a military or Department of Defense position, and emphasized that the reference is strictly to state law rather than a military interpretation.

Planning Director Maggie Castro, AICP, stated that while Mr. Martinez was citing Arizona Revised Statutes, that same title also has a provision for variances.

Vice-Chairman Bryant opened the discussion to the public.

Oscar Galindo, 1305 East County 16th Street, Yuma Arizona, agent, asked for more clarification as to what MCAS's concerns were.

Vice-Chairman Bryant explained the military's concern regarding the state statute restricting residential development within the 65-decibel noise zone and explained that staff might agree with the military's position if the statute did not allow for a variance; however, because a variance process is available, the rezoning would not be the final approval step. Any residential development would still require approval through the variance process. Based on this understanding, the request is considered compatible with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

Oscar Galindo, agent, stated that there is no intent to sell the lots. They currently live on the corner lot, and their father owns the shop on the adjacent corner. The request is to create a lot for the purpose of building a home for their daughter, who is a teacher and cannot currently afford housing. Mr. Galindo emphasized that the property would remain primarily farmland, with only a small portion used for the residence, and that the lots would be larger than two acres. He reiterated that the land would remain for family and agricultural use, with no plans for additional development or sales.

Board member McDermott asked the agent if the plan was to keep the rest of the properties for alfalfa.

Oscar Galindo, agent, stated that it was correct and they also own 10 acres below the property, but it is dried up since they are part of the water program.

There being no one to come forward, Vice-Chairman Bryant closed the discussion to the public

Board member McDermott asked for clarification regarding the assessment section under Health, Safety, and Welfare, noting difficulty reading the small print. She inquired whether the points deducted were related to the property's distance from hospitals and police, specifically referencing emergency response times.

Senior Planner Richard Munguia stated that was correct.

MOTION (ROSALES/ GARCIA): Approve as presented.

VOICE VOTE: VOICE VOTE: Mosqueda-AYE; Rice-AYE; Bowers-AYE; Bryant-AYE; Van Why-AYE; Rosales-AYE; McDermott- AYE; Garcia-AYE

The motion carried 8-0.

Senior Planner Jesus Carrillo requested the Commission to open Minor Amendment Case No. 25-09 and Rezoning Case No. 25-22 simultaneously as they are co-related and same parcel.

ITEM No. 10: Minor Amendment Case No. 25-09: Ibrahim Osman, agent for Majid Jajo, requests to change the land use designation of a parcel approximately 0.97 acres in size from Urban Density Residential (R-UD) to Local Commercial (C-LC), Assessor's Parcel Number 728-12-095, located at 12348 South Foothills Boulevard, Yuma, Arizona.

Senior Planner Jesus Carrillo presented Minor Amendment Case No. 25-09 recommending approval based on:

1. The proposed change will not have an adverse impact on the natural environment or the scenic quality of the area in contradiction to the Plan.
2. The proposed change encourages the development of small business by providing an adequate supply of land classified for small scale commercial usage.
3. The proposed project will not require public expenditures for infrastructure improvements.

MOTION (ROSALES/ MOSQUEDA): Approve as presented.

VOICE VOTE: VOICE VOTE: Mosqueda-AYE; Rice-AYE; Bowers-AYE; Bryant-AYE; Van Why-AYE; Rosales-AYE; McDermott- AYE; Garcia-AYE

The motion carried 8-0.

ITEM No. 11: Rezoning Case No. 25-22: Ibrahim Osman, agent for Majid Jajo, request to rezone a parcel 0.97 gross acres in size from Manufactured Home Subdivision – 20,000 square foot minimum (MHS-20) to Local Commercial (C-1), Assessor's Parcel Number 728-12-095, located at 12348 South Foothills Boulevard, Yuma, Arizona

Senior Planner Jesus Carrillo presented Rezoning Case No. 25-22 recommending approval of the request based on the request being within the range of identified uses, densities and intensities of the Comprehensive Plan, subject to the following Performance Condition and Schedule for Development:

Performance Condition:

1. Within 180 days of approval of the Board of Supervisors, the owner shall submit the following documents to the Department of Development Services:
 - a. A recorded avigation disclosure statement;
 - b. Record of Schedule for Development disclosure statement.

Schedule for Development:

Prior to development of the subject property or within five (5) years of Board of Supervisors' approval, whichever comes first:

1. The Owner/applicant shall acquire and have finalized all required permits as per appropriate code requirements.

Chairman Van Why noted that the property received one of the lowest scores in recent assessments and raised a question regarding the 50-point deduction for land use compatibility related to surrounding area and density.

Vice-Chairman also asked whether this deduction was appropriate given that the adjacent property is commercial, suggesting the score might be reconsidered since the proposed use could be compatible with nearby land.

Planning Director Maggie Castro, AICP, stated a portion of the area that's to the north is designated as Local Commercial, the remainder of the surrounding uses are residential uses, both to the west, south and east.

Vice-Chairman Bryant opened the discussion to the public.

Aaron Salyi, APN 728-07-001, Yuma Arizona, requested that the requirement for a variance related to the transitional buffer yard and screening (paragraph 3020.01) be waived for this development. He noted that due to the narrowness of the lots and lack of side street access, the buffer requirement would add unnecessary cost and difficulty for the property owners and recommended granting the exemption at the outset.

Senior Planner Jesus Carrillo stated that would be part of the building permit and if the applicant does not want to comply with the Zoning Ordinance, they would have to go through the variance process through the Board of Adjustment.

Vice-Chairman Bryant commented that it was accurate and they can do rezoning and minor amendments, but they are not in the position of dealing with those issues.

Planning Director Maggie Castro, AICP, stated the Planning and Zoning Commission does not have the authority to act on waivers or variances from the Yuma County Zoning Ordinance and only the Board of Adjustment has that authority.

Vice-Chairman Bryant commented he understand the reasoning for asking, but the Commission does not have the authority to do it.

Irving Perez, 183 East 24th Street, Yuma Arizona, representative of Mr. Jajo, stated that they agree with the staff's recommendation for approval. He explained that the project intends to provide commercial office suites for professional services such as chiropractors, nail salons, therapy offices, and similar uses. He noted that the development would create additional work and business opportunities for nearby residents and the community, and he expressed support for proceeding with the project.

There being no one to come forward, Vice-Chairman Bryant closed the discussion to the public.

MOTION (ROSALES/ BOWERS): Approve as presented.

VOICE VOTE: VOICE VOTE: Mosqueda-AYE; Rice-AYE; Bowers-AYE; Bryant-AYE; Van Why-AYE; Rosales-AYE; McDermott- AYE; Garcia-AYE

The motion carried 8-0.

ITEM No. 12: Special Use Permit Case No. 25-21: Ryan Halder of Maverik, agent for East Mesa of Yuma LLC, requests a Special Use Permit per Section 612.03(H) of the Yuma County Zoning Ordinance to allow a gas station on a portion of a parcel 29.56± acres in size zoned General Commercial (C-2), Assessor's Parcel Number 701-29-005, located on the northeast corner of North Frontage Road and Foothills Boulevard, Yuma, Arizona.

Senior Planner Javier Barraza presented Special Use Case N. 25-21 recommending approval of the request for the following reasons: 1) The proposed development conforms to existing plans; 2) The proposed use will not materially affect or endanger the public health, safety or welfare; and 3) The proposed development complies with all regulations and standards applicable within the zoning district specifically applicable to the particular type of special use or class of special use. 4) The proposed development will be in harmony with the area in which it is located. Staff recommended attaching the following Performance and Operational Conditions:

Performance Condition.

1. Within 60 days of approval by the Board of Supervisors, the owner or agent shall:
 - a) Record an Avigation disclosure statement.
 - b) Record an Infrastructure disclosure statement.
 - c) Record a Range disclosure statement.

Operational Conditions.

1. The approval of the Special Use Permit is based on the site plan submitted by the applicant. Any changes from the site plan will require approval by the County Planning Director pursuant to Section 402.04 of the Yuma County Zoning Ordinance.
2. The Special Use Permit is limited to a gas station in conjunction with a convenience store.

Board member McDermott asked staff if the whole property was going to be the gas station and facilities available.

Senior Planner Javier Barraza stated that not all of it would be part of it, only the part that is shown on the site plan and would be placed on the C-2 portion of the parcel. Mr. Barraza also explained that the parcel had two zones and it would be on the portion that is zoned C-2 on the western side.

Board member McDermott asked if doing that, it would come up against the RV park area.

Senior Planner Javier Barraza stated that the C-2 would abut the RV park, but only a portion.

Board member McDermott asked about how many access points would be available.

Senior Planner Javier Barraza commented there was only one access point.

Vice-Chairman Bryant opened the discussion to the public.

Daniel Goodwin, 2897 West Rolling Creek Way, South Jordan Utha, agent and representing Maverick, addressed concerns raised in opposition letters regarding the proposed gas station. He clarified that although the Special Use Permit covers 29 acres, Maverick will only develop about 4–4.5 acres, leaving a buffer from the RV park and maintaining spacing within the split zoning area. Mr. Goodwin noted that Maverick's business model does not allow long-term truck parking as the facility is intended for fueling and immediate departure rather than serving as a truck stop. Regarding lighting, the project will comply with Yuma County's lighting ordinance to minimize light pollution and light trespass.

Board member Bowers asked what their intentions were, and what would happen to that part of the land.

Daniel Goodwin, agent, stated that Karen Spencer, the developer, was not present at the meeting, noted that the R-3 zoned component is planned for high-density residential use and that Ms. Spencer owns 157 acres intended for residential development. Mr. Goodwin clarified that they do not represent her and an expert and he could not provide detailed information though her engineers may be present to address questions.

Board member Bowers commented that it was odd that they wanted to develop an apartment complex on high density residential next to a truck stop.

Daniel Goodwin stated they are not classified as a truck stop and it was a split zoning of commercial to residential and that was their intent which was common from a zoning perspective, it was kind of a zoning transition from commercial to high density residential to a lesser density residential.

Board member Bowers asked if Ms. Spencer was aware of the situation happening in that area.

Daniel Goodwin stated Ms. Spencer was aware and they meet every two weeks and that there is a joint traffic study being conducted with her development to address traffic concerns and they are working hand in hand not in opposition.

Board member Rosales commented if they look at other communities, in the big cities, they got apartments or high density, medium density, and top of malls and movie theaters and, it's providing a service and convenience.

Board member McDermott inquired about the floodway and if it was below the property.

Daniel Goodwin, agent, stated the floodway was located to the east and FEMA and flood mapping is part of the due diligence and they are above that.

There being no one to come forward, Vice-Chairman Bryant closed the discussion to the public.

MOTION (BOWERS/ MOSQUEDA): Approve as presented.

VOICE VOTE: VOICE VOTE: Mosqueda-AYE; Rice-AYE; Bowers-AYE; Bryant-AYE; Van Why-AYE; Rosales-AYE; McDermott- AYE; Garcia-AYE

The motion carried 8-0.

ITEM No. 13: Discussion and action concerning a possible text amendment to the Yuma County Zoning Ordinance to limit the number of farm animals on parcels of less than five (5) contiguous commercial acres that are zoned RA and that don't meet the minimum parcel size requirements of the zoning district.

Planning Director Maggie Castro, AICP, presented discussion concerning a possible text amendment to the Yuma County Zoning Ordinance to limit the number of farm animals on parcels of less than five (5) contiguous commercial acres that are zoned RA and that don't meet the minimum parcel size requirements of the zoning district.

The purpose of this text amendment is to amend the Yuma County Zoning Ordinance, Section 601.02(D). Currently, if a parcel is zoned Rural Area (RA) and does not meet the minimum parcel size requirement for the zoning district, they can have an unlimited number of animals if the parcel is five (5) or more contiguous commercial acres since they are exempt from zoning. Because the RA district allows the raising of animals by right, the same applies to pre-ordinance nonconforming parcels that are zoned RA and are less than the acreage required by the district. By adding the proposed wording to the Zoning Ordinance, a parcel that is less than five (5) acres and is zoned RA will be able to have a limited number of farm animals.

The proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance are below. Text that is in bold font is proposed new wording.

Section 601.00--Rural Area Zoning District (RA)

601.01--Purpose

The purpose of this district is to conserve and preserve farms, agricultural related re-sources, continued agricultural use and other open space land uses fostering orderly growth in rural areas, preventing urban and agricultural land use conflicts, and allowing rural lot development with emphasis on preserving the character of farming communities. Principle uses permitted in this zoning district include residential uses on large parcel sizes, farms, agricultural-related land uses, and open space or recreational uses. These regulations apply to all four (4) of the Rural Area districts: Rural Area-40 Acre Minimum (RA-40), Rural Area-20 Acre Minimum (RA-20), Rural Area-10 Acre Minimum (RA-10), and Rural Area-5 Acre Minimum (RA-5).

601.02--Permitted Uses

The following are allowed uses on properties in any of the four Rural Area (RA) zoning districts subject to compliance with the development standards listed below.

- A. One (1) single-family dwelling unit, site-built, factory-built or manufactured home.
- B. Ranch/Farm headquarters office to conduct business related to farming and ranching operations.
- C. Farm Labor housing.
- D. Farms and ranches for the production of crops and/or raising of animals. **On parcels of less than five (5) contiguous commercial acres, the raising of farm animals shall be limited to one (1) animal per ten thousand (10,000) square feet of side and rear yard area. Commercial feedlots are only permitted in Heavy Industrial and Intensive Industrial districts.**
- E. Lakes, ponds, lagoons, irrigation and storm water retention facilities.
- F. Home occupations.
- G. Plant nurseries, nursery stock, and greenhouses for propagation, cultivation and whole-sale distribution of plants produced on the premises, provided such uses do not include retail sales. Open storage is limited to plants or packaged fertilizer and the buildings and structures used in connection with the operation.
- H. Kennels. *32
- I. Seasonal roadside stands offering farm products for sale such as vegetables, fruits, pumpkins, flowers, and Christmas trees.
- J. Storage of agricultural related equipment. Agricultural related equipment is defined as: mechanical equipment used primarily, but not solely for the production of crops and/or raising of animals, or custom farming services.
- K. Warehouse and storage of agricultural products such as bales of alfalfa hay, bales of cotton, citrus, lettuce, fruit cartons and grain silos.

L. Accessory buildings and uses customarily incidental to the above uses such as garages and carports, patios, storage sheds, barns, corrals and arenas, private swimming pools, pool house, tennis courts, fish ponds, walls and fences, signs and parking.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommended forwarding this item to the Board of Supervisors for comments and input

Planning Director Maggie Castro, AICP, explained that staff was asked to review a potential amendment to the zoning ordinance that would limit the number of farm animals on properties that are less than five contiguous commercial acres. Under state statute, properties that are five or more contiguous commercial acres and used for general agricultural purposes are exempt from zoning regulations for agricultural uses. Currently, RA-zoned properties that do not meet minimum acreage requirements may have an unlimited number of farm animals because farm animals are allowed by right in the RA zoning district. Ms. Castro stated if the Board chooses to proceed, the proposed amendment would apply only to RA-zoned properties under five acres and would impose the same farm animal limits that currently exist in the Suburban Ranch and Suburban Site zoning districts.

Vice-Chairman Bryant asked if staff if they had an idea how many parcels this could affect, meaning are there a lot of parcels out there that are zoned RA that are less than five acres.

Planning Director Maggie Castro, AICP, noted that while the exact number has not been calculated, there are many nonconforming properties that do not meet the minimum parcel size requirements and are zoned Rural Area (RA).

Board member Rice asked staff what was the limit.

Planning Director Maggie Castro, AICP, pointed out item D on the staff report, it stated that on parcels that are less than five contiguous commercial acres, the raising of farm animals shall be limited to one animal per 10,000 square feet of side and rear yard area.

Board member Rice asked if it was just one animal.

Planning Director Maggie Castro, AICP, stated that one animal per 10,000 square feet would allow four animals per acre.

Board member Mosqueda asked if it was necessary to define farm animals on a farm.

Planning Director Maggie Castro, AICP, noted that the zoning ordinance currently has a definition of what a small farm animal is versus a large farm animal.

Board member Garcia asked if you're allowed to have four horses and what about if you have a dog, would that make it five.

Planning Director Maggie Castro, AICP, stated a dog is not a farm animal and not livestock.

Board member Garcia asked if a sheep was a pet.

Board member Rosales questioned the reason for requesting the proposed amendment, asking whether there is a significant number of properties under five acres with more than 20 animals that are creating nuisances or generating complaints. They noted that under the proposal, a four-and-a-half-acre parcel could still have up to 19 livestock and questioned whether that amount is truly problematic, especially given that some residents keep animals such as pet pigs or chickens. Mr. Rosales asked whether the request was driven by documented complaints or nuisance issues, or if it was simply a policy decision, and requested clarification on the underlying reasoning for bringing the matter forward.

Board member Rice asked who was going to enforce the change.

Planning Director Maggie Castro, AICP, stated if a complaint was filed and the amendment to the zoning ordinance went through it, then it would go through the zoning violation process and deputy zoning inspector would go out and investigate whether there is a violation.

Vice-Chairman Bryant commented staff has done their part and we can run it up the line to the Board of Supervisors. They will decide that they don't think it should move forward. But if they send it back to us and tell us to work on it, then we can go deeper, so then, the staff needs just direction or motion to send this forward your recommendation.

MOTION (MCDERMOTT/ VAN WHY): Approve as presented.

VOICE VOTE: VOICE VOTE: Mosqueda-AYE; Rice-AYE; Bowers-AYE; Bryant-AYE; Van Why-AYE; Rosales-AYE; McDermott- AYE; Garcia-AYE

The motion carried 8-0.

Board member Rosales inquired staff about data for future agenda items, meaning if the meetings could be moved to 5:00 p.m. instead of 5:30 p.m. and how beneficial it was to have meetings later.

Planning Director Maggie Castro, AICP, commented that the 2026 meeting schedule just approved stated meetings starting at 5:30 p.m. and the Commission could take action to move the meetings to 5:00 p.m.

County Attorney Minday Davy noted that the Commission could amend the motion that was already made.

Board member Rosales explained it was just a cost for everyone to have meetings a later time. and by moving the time the county saves money by not giving staff the overtime. It's being fiscally responsible.

Board member McDermott commented she has not seen a big difference in the number of people, if there was a topic of interest, they will show up.

Chairman Van Why asked staff for their opinion on the preferred times.

Planning Director Maggie Castro, said staff preferred the meetings to start at 5:00 p.m.

Item No. 5: Review and approval of the 2026 Regular Meeting Schedule for the Planning & Zoning Commission.

MOTION (ROSALES/ VAN WHY): Move the meeting start time from 5:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

VOICE VOTE: Mosqueda-AYE; Rice-AYE; Bowers-AYE; Bryant-AYE; Van Why-AYE; Rosales-AYE; McDermott-AYE; Garcia-AYE

Motion carried 8-0.

Planning Director Maggie Castro, AICP, informed the Commission that starting March or April, the Planning and Zoning Commission meetings might move to the new administration building.

County Attorney Minda Davy presented Keisa Morrison, new Civil Deputy for the County Attorney's Office. Ms. Davy also informed the Commission that it would be her last meeting since she is leaving the county.

Vice-Chairman opened the call to the public.

Antonio Martinez, MCAS, Yuma Arizona, clarified that the ARS was established in 2005, not a few years ago, and included exceptions for land developed before 2004, along with a timeline for landowners to rezone their parcels at that time. He emphasized that landowners had the opportunity to rezone prior to the ARS taking effect and that the ARS was not penalizing landowners in recent years.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Vice-Chairman Van Why adjourned the meeting at 6:36 p.m.

Approved and accepted on this 27th day of January 2026.



Ron Van Why, Chairman

ATTEST:

Maggie Castro, AICP, Planning Director


